

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-17, 19-28, 30, and 31 will be pending upon entry of the present amendment. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 20, and 24 are amended, and claims 18 and 29 are cancelled.

Applicant thanks Examiners Pape and Feild for their consideration in conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned representative on July 28, 2006. The general topic of discussion was language appropriate to distinguish the claims over the Anderson and Gianelo references, upon at least one of which each rejection relies.

Applicant noted that Anderson did not teach or suggest a personal computer having a power supply, and suggested that such an additional limitation might be sufficient to distinguish over Anderson. Applicant also noted that Gianelo does not provide any teaching or suggestion regarding a gasket or other means for preventing movement of air around a personal computer cabinet.

With regard to claims including a limitation directed to selectively drawing air from within an enclosure or from outside the enclosure (claim 30, for example), applicant noted that none of the art of record teaches or suggests such a limitation. This was also recognized by Examiner Pape in the Office Action of July 20, 2005 (see page 10).

For her part, Examiner Feild noted that, as written, the independent claims were not limited to personal computers in tower cases. Applicant's representative understood this observation to suggest that a limitation to a computer having a tower case might be sufficient to distinguish over Anderson, which is directed to a mini-mainframe type computer.

In view of the aspects outlined above, applicant has amended the claims as follows: claim 1 is amended to include a power supply in the personal computer; claim 24 is amended to include transferring heat from a power supply within a personal computer case; claim 6 has been amended to recite the computer, separately encased in a tower case; and claim 20 has been amended to recite a tower case configured to be coupled to the chassis.

Claim 29 has been cancelled as having a scope that is substantially identical to that of claim 30.

In view of the amendments and discussion with the Examiners, applicant believes that the independent claims are now in condition for allowance over the art of record, and that the dependent claims are also, therefore, in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the specific rejections of the recent Office Action will not be addressed.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now believed to be allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicants' undersigned representative at (206) 694-4848 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/HHB/  
Harold H. Bennett II  
Registration No. 52,404

HHB:wt

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300  
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

780886\_1.DOC